

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/498,429	02/04/2000	Mark E. Holzbach	065113.0146	8813
33031	7590 04/28/2004		EXAMI	NER
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON ASCOLESE, LLP			POON, KING Y	
4807 SPICE BLDG. 4, SU	EWOOD SPRINGS RD. SUITE 201		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, T			2624	2
			DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004	,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	Application No.				
	09/498,429	HOLZBACH ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	King Y. Poon	2624			
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATORY Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicator if the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) dayor if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, the Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	FION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a stion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thi y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rly (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>23 February 2004</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b)	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w 5) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-16 and 21 is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 17-20 and 22-31 is/are rejected 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	rithdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 February 2000</u> Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	② is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ to the drawing(s) be held in abeya correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). i(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A ne priority documents have beer Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date			
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO-1449 or P		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2624

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 17-20, 22-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonny Gustafsson (Internet-based support for the production of holographic stereograms, Practical Holography XII, March, 1998, pp. 169-174) in view of Kihara et al. (US 6,236,475).

Regarding claim 17: Gustafsson teaches a method (all the discussion is referring to specification of the end user interface, page 171, unless stated otherwise) for producing master holographic stereograms (holograms) (line 4; note) on-demand for an individual customer, (user line 2) from customer-provided source material, (VRML file, line 4) comprising the steps of acquiring image data (image, lines 6-8) at a data acquisition station (the place where the user's computer is located), having a data acquisition processor (the processing software of the user's computer that receives image data from the VRML file, lines 3-8) that receives image data based on the source material and a customer-based preview processor (the software of the user's computer that controls the display of the hologram to the user, lines 3-9) that displays a

Art Unit: 2624

of the hologram for viewing by the customer; delivering the image data to an image processing station. (Producer or printer, lines 10-11)

Gustafsson does not teach an image processor operable to generate hogel data based on image data received from the data acquisition station; and delivering the hogel data to a printing station having a spatial light modulator for receiving the hogel data from the image processor and for displaying holographic object images, and having a printer for producing a holographic stereogram.

Kihara, in the same area of printing holograms, teaches it is well known in the art that a hologram is printed by using an image processing station (data processor 11, column 10, lines 14-32) having an image processor (inherent properties of a data processor) operable to generate hogel data (signal of D5, fig. 6, column 10, lines 30-35) based on image data received from a data acquisition station (14, or computer 15, fig. 6); and delivering the hogel data to a printing station (printer device 13, and control computer 12, column 10, lines 40-45) having a spatial light modulator (LCD 18, column 10, lines 40-50) for receiving the hogel data (D5 fig. 6) from the image processor and for displaying holographic object images, (column 11, lines 25-32) and having a printer (printer head, column 12, lines 45-52) for producing a holographic stereogram. (Hologram 19, column 11, lines 20-25)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gustafsson's system to include: an image processor, in the image processing station, operable to generate hogel data based on image data received from the data acquisition station; and delivering the hogel

Art Unit: 2624

data to a printing station having a spatial light modulator for receiving the hogel data from the image processor and for displaying holographic object images, and having a printer for producing a holographic stereogram.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gustafsson's system by the teaching of Kihara because of the following reasons: (a) it would have allowed Gustafsson's system to be able to print the hologram; and (b) using a well-known method of creating the hologram would have allowed users benefit from years of research and experience that has been used in producing holograms such that the hologram produced would have the highest quality with less cost.

Note: Inherently, all holograms are masters because inherently, hologram provides images and images can be converted into hologram.

Regarding claim 18: Gustafsson teaches wherein the data acquisition station is remote from the image processing station and the printing station. (Internet, page 171)

Regarding claim 19: Gustafsson does not teach wherein the image processing station also has an operator-based preview processor operable to display a representation of the hologram for viewing by an operator of the image processor.

However, Gustafsson teaches to use a computer to display a representation of the hologram for viewing by a user of the image processor.

Since a producer is a human and is controlling the producing of the hologram, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gustafsson's system to include: wherein the

Art Unit: 2624

image processing station (computer) also has an operator-based preview processor operable to display a representation of the hologram for viewing by an operator of the image processor; because it would have allowed the producer to view what he is doing and help him to reduce error.

Regarding claim 20: Gustafsson teaches wherein the data acquisition station is a personal computer. (Computer, ordinary user, page 169)

Regarding claim 22: Gustafsson taches wherein the data acquisition processor and the customer-based preview processor execute with programming downloaded to the personal computer. (Download VRML browser, page 171)

Regarding claim 23: Gustafsson teaches wherein the customer-based preview processor displays preview images downloaded from a server. (VRML images displayed in a browser from Web page of a WWW server transmitted over Internet, page 171).

Regarding claim 24: Gustafsson teaches wherein the data acquisition processor receives at least input from a video source. (Animated images, lines 8, page 171, specification of the end user interface)

Regarding claim 25: Gustafsson teaches wherein the data acquisition processor receives at least input from two dimensional printed material. (Photograph, page 169, lines 1-6, introduction)

Regarding claim 26: Gustafsson teaches the step of compositing image data from different source material. (Add and remove data, page 170, e.g., the adding and

Art Unit: 2624

removing of data from 3D scene, the data (source) added is different (new) compares to original data (source data before data being added))

Regarding claim 27: Gustafsson teaches wherein the compositing occurs at the data acquisition station. (Browser of user, page 170)

Regarding claim 28: Gustafsson teaches wherein the compositing occurs at a server site, such that the pre-view processor displays composited preview images download from the server sites.

Note: Gustafsson teaches downloaded 3D images in VRML format from other computer/server, page 170; load VRML files from computer systems or disk, page 171; and upload the composite VRML files to another computer located in the producer. Therefore, Gustafsson teaches compositing of images occurs at one computer site; and displayed the composited preview images, download from the one computer site, in another computer site.

Regarding claim 29: Gustafsson does not teach wherein the image processing station and printing station are geographically remote and in data communication.

However, Gustafsson teaches communication using Internet (page 171) and the concept of using Internet is to allow two communication parties to be remote from each other.

Since the image processing station and the printing station are two different devices communicating with each other; it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gustafsson's system by the teaching of Internet technology and concept to include:

Application/Control Number: 09/498,429 Page 7

Art Unit: 2624

wherein the image processing station and printing station are geographically remote and in data communication.

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gustafsson's system by the teaching of Internet technology and concept because it would have expanded the hologram producing system of Gustafsson by allowing the image processing station to control a printing system everywhere in the world.

Regarding claim 30: Gustafsson teaches wherein the data acquisition processor delivers 2D sequence data to the image processor. (A number of plane polygonal patches, page 170)

Regarding claim 31: Gustafsson teaches wherein the data acquisition processor delivers computer generated 3D graphics data to the image processor. (VRML file, page 169, 170)

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-16, 21 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2624

With respect to applicant's argument that Gustafsson does not teach the VRML file is in any way based on the customer provided source material, has been considered.

In reply: Page 171, line 4, specification of the end user interface, teaches user loads his (customer) VRML files (source material) into the browser.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to King Y. Poon whose telephone number is (703) 305-0892

April 26, 2004

Jan for